
Performance review process report

The Open University, 2018-22

Executive summary

This is a report of the process to review the performance of The Open University. This report captures the process we have undertaken to consider the performance of the institution in delivering HCPC-approved programmes. This enables us to make risk-based decisions about how to engage with this provider in the future, and to consider if there is any impact on our standards being met.

We have:

- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission against our institution level standards and found our standards are met in this area following exploration of key themes through quality activities.
- Reviewed the institution's portfolio submission to consider which themes needed to be explored through quality activities.
- Recommended the institution should not be reviewed again as the last approved programme is closing and learners on the programme will graduate in the next two years.

Through this assessment, we have noted the provider should not engage with monitoring because the programme is closing, and learners will graduate in the next two years.

Previous consideration	This is the education provider's first interaction with the performance review process.
Decision	The Education and Training Committee (Panel) is asked to decide: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the education provider does not need to engage with future performance reviews
Next steps	Outline next steps / future case work with the provider: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Executive take forward a closure of programme activity relating the closing programme.

Included within this report

Outline next steps / future case work with the provider:.....	1
Section 1: About this assessment	3
About us	3
Our standards.....	3
Our regulatory approach.....	3
The performance review process.....	3
Thematic areas reviewed.....	4
How we make our decisions	4
The assessment panel for this review.....	4
Section 2: About the education provider.....	5
The education provider context	5
Practice areas delivered by the education provider	5
Institution performance data	6
Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes.....	8
Portfolio submission.....	8
Section 4: Findings.....	9
Overall findings on performance	9
Quality theme: Institution self-reflection	9
Quality theme: Thematic reflection.....	11
Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection	12
Quality theme: Profession specific reflection.....	14
Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions	15
Data and reflections	16
Section 5: Issues identified for further review	17
Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes.....	17
Assessment panel recommendation.....	17
Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution	19

Section 1: About this assessment

About us

We are the Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC), a regulator set up to protect the public. We set standards for education and training, professional knowledge and skills, conduct, performance and ethics; keep a register of professionals who meet those standards; approve programmes which professionals must complete before they can register with us; and take action when professionals on our Register do not meet our standards.

This is a report on the performance review process undertaken by the HCPC to ensure that the institution and practice areas(s) detailed in this report continue to meet our education standards. The report details the process itself, evidence considered, outcomes and recommendations made regarding the institution and programme(s) ongoing approval.

Our standards

We approve education providers and programmes that meet our education standards. Individuals who complete approved programmes will meet proficiency standards, which set out what a registrant should know, understand and be able to do when they complete their education and training. The education standards are outcome focused, enabling education providers to deliver programmes in different ways, as long as individuals who complete the programme meet the relevant proficiency standards.

Our regulatory approach

We are flexible, intelligent and data-led in our quality assurance of programme clusters and programmes. Through our processes, we:

- enable bespoke, proportionate and effective regulatory engagement with education providers;
- use data and intelligence to enable effective risk-based decision making; and
- engage at the organisation, profession and programme levels to enhance our ability to assess the impact of risks and issues on HCPC standards.

Providers and programmes are [approved on an open-ended basis](#), subject to ongoing monitoring. Programmes we have approved are listed [on our website](#).

The performance review process

Once a programme institution is approved, we will take assurance it continues to meet standards through:

- regular assessment of key data points, supplied by the education provider and external organisations; and
- assessment of a self-reflective portfolio and evidence, supplied on a cyclical basis

Through monitoring, we take assurance in a bespoke and flexible way, meaning that we will assess how an education provider is performing based on what we see, rather than by a one size fits all approach. We take this assurance at the provider level wherever possible, and will delve into programme / profession level detail where we need to.

This report focuses on the assessment of the self-reflective portfolio and evidence.

Thematic areas reviewed

We normally focus on the following areas:

- Institution self-reflection, including resourcing, partnerships, quality, the input of others, and equality and diversity
- Thematic reflection, focusing on timely developments within the education sector
- Provider reflection on the assessment of other sector bodies, including professional bodies and systems regulators
- Provider reflection on developments linked to specific professions
- Stakeholder feedback and actions

How we make our decisions

We make independent evidence based decisions about programme approval. For all assessments, we ensure that we have profession specific input in our decision making. In order to do this, we appoint [partner visitors](#) to design quality assurance assessments, and assess evidence and information relevant to the assessment. Visitors make recommendations to the Education and Training Committee (ETC). Education providers have the right of reply to the recommendation. If an education provider wishes to, they can supply 'observations' as part of the process.

The ETC make the decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of programmes. In order to do this, they consider recommendations detailed in process reports, and any observations from education providers (if submitted). The Committee takes decisions through different levels depending on the routines and impact of the decision, and where appropriate meets in public. Their decisions are available to view [on our website](#).

The assessment panel for this review

We appointed the following panel members to support a review of this education provider:

Wendy Smith	Lead visitor, Chiropodist/podiatrist
Amy Hancock	Lead visitor, Radiographer
Mohammed Jeewa	Service User Expert Advisor
Saranjit Binning	Education Quality Officer
Tracey Samuel-Smith	Education Manager

We encourage reflections through portfolios to be made at the institution level wherever possible. The performance review process does not always require profession level scrutiny which requires all professionals to be represented in the assessment panel. Rather, the process considers how the education provider has performed at institution level, linked to the themes defined in section 1. Lead visitors have the option to appoint additional advisory partners where this will benefit the assessment, and / or where they are not able to make judgements based on their own professional knowledge.

In this assessment, we considered we did not require professional expertise across all professional areas delivered by the education provider. We considered this because the lead visitors were satisfied, they could assess performance and risk without needing to consider professional areas outside of their own.

Section 2: About the education provider

The education provider context

The education provider currently delivers a post registration programme for the prescribing annotation. It is a Higher Education Institute and has been running HCPC approved programmes since 2019.

The education provider offers distance learning and online programmes at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. This means they operate across the four home countries.

The education provider previously ran programmes, such for Operating department practitioners and Paramedics. However, these programmes are closed and had last graduation dates of 2016 and 2018 respectively. They were therefore not included in this review period.

The remaining programme is an independent / supplement prescribing programme which is referenced as the Non-Medical Prescribing (NMP) programme. This is a module which can be undertaken as part of the wider Advanced Clinical Practice (ACP) master's programme (which does not have HCPC approval). However, through the course of this review, we learnt this programme is closing. The education provider outlined the last intake will be September 2023. We are liaising with the education provider to remove ongoing approval from it.

This is the education providers first engagement with the new quality assurance model.

Practice areas delivered by the education provider

The provider is approved to deliver training in the following professional areas. A detailed list of approved programme awards can be found in [Appendix 1](#) of this report.

	Practice area	Delivery level	Approved since
Post-registration	Independent Prescribing / Supplementary prescribing		2019

Institution performance data

Data is embedded into how we understand performance and risk. We capture data points in relation to provider performance, from a range of sources. We compare provider data points to benchmarks, and use this information to inform our risk based decisions about the approval and ongoing approval of institutions and programmes¹.

Data Point	Benchmark	Value	Date of data point	Commentary
Numbers of learners	100	75	2022	<p>The benchmark figure is data we have captured from previous interactions with the education provider, such as through initial programme approval, and / or through previous performance review assessments. Resources available for the benchmark number of learners was assessed and accepted through these processes. The value figure was presented by the education provider through this submission.</p> <p>The education provider is recruiting learners below the benchmark.</p> <p>We sought clarification about this. In the response the education provider informed us they had made the decision to withdraw the NMP programme. September 2023 will therefore be the last intake.</p>
Learner non continuation	3%	0%	2019-20	There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to

¹ An explanation of the data we use, and how we use this data, is available [here](#)

				<p>establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they decided not to establish this data point through the submission. They have provided further reflection on this in the portfolio.</p> <p>As the programme is closing, there is no requirement to establish this data point going forward.</p>
Outcomes for those who complete programmes	94%	97%	2019-20	<p>This HESA data was sourced from a data delivery. This means the data is a bespoke HESA data return, filtered bases on HCPC-related subjects.</p> <p>The data point is above the benchmark, which suggests the provider is performing above sector norms</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 3%</p> <p>We explored this by reviewing the reflection provided in the portfolio. Visitors were satisfied with the narrative provided by the education provider and noted the programme required learners to be in employment.</p>
Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award	N/A	N/A	N/A	<p>There is no data available for this data point. We asked the education provider to consider if they wanted to establish ongoing data reporting for this and other data points through this performance review assessment, and they</p>

				<p>decided not to establish this data point through the submission.</p> <p>We explored this by reviewing the portfolio in which they informed us they have made the decision not to apply for the award. They have reflected on this in the portfolio.</p>
Learner satisfaction	83.8%	85.7%	2022	<p>This NSS data was sourced at the summary. This means the data is the provider-level public data.</p> <p>The data point is broadly equal to the benchmark, which suggests the provider's performance in this area is in line with sector norms.</p> <p>When compared to the previous year's data point, the education provider's performance has improved by 1.9%.</p> <p>We explored this by reviewing the reflection provided in the portfolio. Visitors were satisfied the education provider were performing above the benchmark, however noted the National Student Survey did not apply to the postgraduate provision.</p> <p>As the programme is closing, there is no requirement to establish an alternative data point going forward.</p>

Section 3: Performance analysis and quality themes

Portfolio submission

The education provider was asked to provide a self-reflective portfolio submission covering the broad topics referenced in the [thematic areas reviewed](#) section of this report.

The education provider's self-reflection was focused on challenges, developments, and successes related to each thematic area. They also supplied data, supporting evidence and information.

Section 4: Findings

This section provides information summarising the visitors' findings for each portfolio area, focusing on the approach or approaches taken, developments, what this means for performance, and why. The section also includes a summary of risks, further areas to be followed up, and areas of good practice.

Overall findings on performance

Quality theme: Institution self-reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Resourcing, including financial stability –**
 - The education provider operates a five-year strategy (2022-2027). They outlined how this considered financial targets, learner number planning and sustainability.
 - The approved NMP programme is a module contained within the Advanced Clinical Practitioner (ACP) master's programme (not approved by HCPC). The education provider reflected how, inclusion in the ACP, had made the approved programme harder to market and therefore, recruit learners to.
 - The education provider noted they had decided to not bid for the latest NHS England (previously Health Education England) funding for community pharmacy placements. Therefore, their focus would change to deliver a standalone programme for self-funded learners. As part of this, the education provider reflected that learner numbers would increase.
 - Through clarification about learner numbers and resources, the education provider outlined, that since submitting the portfolio, they had reached a decision to withdraw the approved NMP programme. This decision had been reached due to the low learner numbers and further consideration about the ongoing sustainability of the programme. The last intake for these learners will be September 2023.
 - Therefore, the visitors had no further questions about the sustainability of the programme and considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Partnerships with other organisations –**
 - The education provider reflected on the range of partnerships they have. The Senate has ultimate responsibility for approving and reviewing new partnerships. The aim is to widen access and participation through these relationships.

- The visitors recognised the main partnerships for the NMP programme were with practice placement providers and educators. This was managed through the Partnership Team.
- The education provider reflected on how the Staff Tutor role, which plays an important role in managing these relationships, had been vacant for several months. While this post is now filled, academic assessors were required to manage this for individual learners. Practice placement providers and educators remained connected and active during this period.
- Through clarification about area, the education provider outlined, that since submitting the portfolio, they had reached a decision to withdraw the approved NMP programme. This decision had been reached due to the low learner numbers and further consideration about the ongoing sustainability of the programme. The last intake for these learners will be September 2023.
- Therefore, the visitors had no further concerns about the partnerships of the programme and considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Academic and placement quality –**
 - Across the provision, the education provider highlighted learners were required to find their own practice-based learning site. For the NMP programme, learners were also required to find their own Designated Prescribing Practitioner (DPP).
 - Some learners struggled to find an appropriate site / DPP initially, or struggled to commit sufficient time, which resulted in changes to their site / DPP. In these circumstances, the education provider worked with the learner to find suitable sites. The education provider concluded that they will only recruit learners with a suitable site / DPP going forward.
 - Relating to ongoing academic quality for the NMP programme, the education provider reflected on the roles they have recruited to during the period. These included Associates Lecturers and the Programme Chair. These mitigations, which allowed continuity of delivery and assessment, ensured academic quality was appropriate.
 - The visitors felt the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Interprofessional education –**
 - The visitors noted how the very nature of the post registration NMP programme ensured interprofessional learning. For example, the makeup of the cohort of learners were from the HCPC, (Nursing and Midwifery Council) NMC or the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) registers.
 - The education provider outlined how these learners worked together throughout the programme.
 - The visitors were therefore satisfied with the education providers performance in this area.
- **Service users and carers –**
 - The education provider highlighted that, generally, it had been challenging to maintain service user and carer involvement due to the pandemic. As a result, they put in place additional measures, such as setting up remote groups, following informal conversions. This allowed

- some members of the group to participate who would not have been able to attend a physical meeting.
- Specifically, for the NMP programme, they participated as part of the Service User and Carers Group (SUCG). From copies of minutes and action points, the visitors identified involvement and feedback taken forward.
 - The visitors felt the education provider had performed well in this area.
 - **Equality and diversity –**
 - The education provider identified that, “high-level data analytics” regarding Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI), did not allow programme specific analysis to be undertaken.
 - To assist in this, the education implemented an Inclusive Curriculum tool to provide programme teams with the granular data they needed to produce appropriate learning materials. This is in the early stages and more analysis of the benefits will be undertaken at a later date.
 - Specifically, for the NMP programme, the education provider outlined how they effectively supported a number of learners with learning difficulties, so they obtained the same level of learning as others.
 - The visitors felt the education provider had performed well in this area.
 - **Horizon scanning –**
 - Through the portfolio submission, the education provider discussed challenges, developments and successes relating to the NMP programme. This included the planned use of a new Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) and increasing stakeholder engagement.
 - Through clarification about plans to implement a new VLE, the education provider outlined, that since submitting the portfolio, they had reached a decision to withdraw the approved NMP programme. This decision had been reached due to the low learner number and further consideration about the sustainability of the programme. The last intake for these learners will be September 2023.
 - The visitors therefore had no concerns about the programme and considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Thematic reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Impact of COVID-19 –**
 - The education provider recognised the range of stakeholders impacted by COVID-19 and the challenges each of them faced. For example, for the programme team, had to consider how to deliver effective and appropriate learning / assessment when face-to-face options had previously been the main option. Specifically, for the NMP programme, the visitors recognised this did not have such an impact on the programme due to the nature of distance learning delivery method.

- However, the education provider noted that senior healthcare workers, who were often the learners, were under an extreme level of pressure. Additional support was provided to this stakeholder group in the form of extensions and remote invigilation. This provided them with greater flexibility in meeting the requirements of the programme.
- Feedback received from the learners, positively supported the ability of the programme to continue running during the pandemic.
- The education provider has returned to pre-COVID-19 regulations.
- The visitors considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Use of technology: Changing learning, teaching and assessment methods –**
 - On a general level, the education provider has no purpose-built software for invigilation. The Adobe Connect system used had been problematic for learners due to the internet band width required.
 - As such, they put in place mitigations to support the learners and invigilators. For example, through initial teaching sessions, they stressed the importance of using the system, provided training on how to use it, and ensured appropriate access.
 - As outlined earlier in this report, the education provider will be considering their continued use of, and expansion of, a new Virtual Learning Environment.
 - Through clarification about learner numbers and the use of technology, the education provider outlined, that since submitting the portfolio, they had reached a decision to withdraw the approved NMP programme. This decision had been reached due to the low learner number and further consideration about the sustainability of the programme. The last intake for these learners will be September 2023.
 - The visitors had no further concerns about the use of technology and considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Apprenticeships –**
 - The education provider has been running degree apprenticeship programmes since 2017. However, they run no HCPC approved apprenticeship programmes.
 - The Office for Standards in Education (OfSTED) was due to visit the education provider between October 2022 and March 2023. In preparation for this, the Apprenticeships Scrutiny Group (AQSG) had rated itself as “Requiring Improvement” due to their qualification achievement rate being below the national average.
 - While the education provider currently offers a range of degree apprenticeship programmes, there are no plans to deliver any for the health and care professions.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Sector body assessment reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Assessments against the UK Quality Code for Higher Education –**
 - The education provider outlined how their Academic Quality and Standards team ensure their policies and processes aligned with the UK Quality Code for Higher Education.
 - The education provider also discussed the challenges of operating across the four home countries. As they were required to meet the quality / regulatory / funding body regulations in each country, this meant the assessment burden was higher than regionally based education providers. The visitors recognised the challenges this additional scrutiny created.
 - A Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) institutional Quality Enhancement Review (QER) was undertaken in March 2021. Since the visit, documents have been updated and streamlined to reflect the Office for Students (OfS) revised conditions of registration.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Assessment of practice education providers by external bodies –**
 - Due to the mode of delivery, learners are required to find their own practice-based learning sites. The education provider then reviews the report from the relevant assessment body to ensure the site is appropriate.
 - The education provider also considers Care Quality Commission (CQC) reports, clinical incidents, or significant changes regarding practice-based learning sites to determine if the site remains appropriate and safe for the learner.
 - The education provider also discussed the challenges of operating across the four home countries. As they were required to meet the quality / regulatory / funding body regulations in each country, this meant the assessment burden was higher than regionally based education providers. The visitors recognised the challenges this additional scrutiny created.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **National Student Survey (NSS) outcomes –**
 - As outlined in the data table above, the NSS data was sourced at the summary. This means the data is at the provider-level public data. This shows the education provider is performing above the benchmark.
 - The visitors recognised that the NMP programme is not included within this data as it is a post-registration qualification.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Office for Students monitoring –**
 - The last QAA review was undertaken in March 2021 and the education provider outlined how work was being undertaken to address the commendations, recommendations and affirmations from the review. These actions are outlined in the QER.
 - The education provider also discussed the challenges of operating across the four home countries. As they were required to meet the

funding body regulations in each country, this meant the assessment burden was higher than regionally based education providers. The visitors recognised the challenges this additional scrutiny created.

- The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Other professional regulators / professional bodies –**
 - Across the provision, the education provider worked with a range of professional regulators and professional bodies.
 - In relation to the NMP programme, three regulatory bodies were involved in the programme. In addition to the HCPC, the Nursing and Midwifery Council (NMC) and the General Pharmaceutical Council (GPhC) approved the programme and / or wider ACP programme.
 - The education provider discussed how, during COVID-19, rapid changes to programmes had been made and positive support was received from stakeholders to the changes.
 - The NMP programme was successfully reaccredited by GPhC in November 2021. No recommendations were outlined, or changes required to the programme, following their review.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed well in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Profession specific reflection

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Curriculum development –**
 - As outlined in the section above, the NMP programme was reaccredited by GPhC in November 2021. The programme was considered against the new standards and competency framework for prescribers. No recommendations were outlined, or changes required to the programme following their review.
 - The reaccreditation allowed the NMP programme to utilise DPP and Designated Medical Practitioners (DMPs) which increased the number of individuals available to undertake supervision.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Development to reflect changes in professional body guidance –**
 - Across the provision, the education provider worked with a range of professional bodies. They reflected on the different requirements, particularly for the NMP programme.
 - For example, the NMP programme is delivered at Level 7. This is not the requirement for each of the relevant professional bodies. However, mitigations were in place. For example, they ensured application material clearly outlined the programme was delivered at Level 7.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Capacity of practice-based learning –**

- Due to the mode of delivery, learners are required to find their own practice-based learning sites. The education provider then reviews the appropriate report from the relevant assessment body to ensure the site is effective and safe.
- As part of the admissions process, the education provider negotiates this with the learners. They recognised that, due to COVID-19, there had been increased pressure on capacity. To address this, the education provider liaised with NHS England and The Open University Business Development Team.
- The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Quality theme: Stakeholder feedback and actions

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learners –**
 - Across the provision, the education provider collected learner feedback through a variety of mechanisms. For example, end of module student satisfactory surveys.
 - For the NMP programme, the education provider reflected that this method had produced a “disappointing” response rate (less than 50%). They therefore put in place a number of mitigations. For example, feedback opportunities were introduced throughout the programme to collect feedback via the Institute of Clinical Science and Technology (ICST) self-directed learning unit. Response rates are being monitored.
 - From the feedback received for the NMP programme, learner feedback led to a mock exam being incorporated and additional case studies created to, for example, enhance history taking.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed well in this area.
- **Practice placement educators –**
 - The education provider reflected it was “challenging” to obtain formal feedback from practice placement educators. The main way the stakeholder feedback had been received was through ad-hoc learner meetings.
 - To mitigate for this, the education provider implemented formal face-to-face meetings to build relationships and gain feedback within a specific meeting / period. Practice educator feedback about these formal meetings has so far been positive.
 - The education provider confirmed they received no complaints about the programme from practice placement educators.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider had performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **External examiners –**
 - Across the provision, the education provider received External Examiner (EE) reports for each programme / module. External

examiners met with the relevant programme / module Chair at defined points. This helped to quality assure the assessments. The education provider outlined how a new IT system for EE's use was in development.

- Outside of the regular and formal points for EE involvement, the Chair for the NMP programme consulted the EE about any possible improvements or developments going forward. The Chair will continue to engage the EE in this way.
- Through clarification about the new IT system, the education provider outlined, that since submitting the portfolio, they had reached a decision to withdraw the approved NMP programme. This decision had been reached due to the low learner number and further consideration about the sustainability of the programme. The last intake for these learners will be September 2023.
- Therefore, the visitors had no concerns about the IT system for EE's and considered the education provider had performed well in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Data and reflections

Findings of the assessment panel:

- **Learner non continuation:**
 - As outlined in the data table above, no information was available for learner non continuation.
 - However, for the NMP programme, the education provider reflected how COVID-19 had meant a small number of learners did not complete the programme as they had had to leave due to workplace pressures. A number of other learners had taken extensions during the initial pandemic period.
 - Additional support was provided to these learners and the success rates continue to be monitored.
 - Through clarification about learner numbers, the education provider outlined, that since submitting the portfolio, they had reached a decision to withdraw the approved NMP programme. This decision had been reached due to the low learner number and further consideration about the sustainability of the programme. The last intake for these learners will be September 2023.
 - The visitors therefore recognise there is no requirement for the education provider to develop this data point further. They therefore considered the education provider performed satisfactorily in this area.
- **Outcomes for those who complete programmes:**
 - Due to the mode of delivery across the provision, learners are required to find their own practice-based learning site. The visitors recognised the higher score in this area than the benchmark.
 - The NMP programme is a distance learning post registration programme. Therefore, the number of learners in employment at the beginning and end of the programme is 100%.

- The visitors therefore considered the education provider performed well in this area.
- **Teaching quality:**
 - In 2017, the education provider decided not to apply for the voluntary Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) award. They considered the core metrics and methodology was not appropriate to determine the quality of distance learning provision.
 - In June 2021, the OfS invited those English education providers, without a TEF award, to apply for a provisional award. The education provider received the provisional award in September 2021.
 - In January 2023, the education provider outlined how they would submit an application for the TEF 2023. They are waiting to receive the outcome of this.
 - The visitors therefore considered the education provider performed well in this area.
- **Learner satisfaction:**
 - As outlined in the data table above, the NSS data was sourced at the summary. This means the data is at the provider-level public data.
 - This data shows the education provider is performing above the benchmark.
 - The visitors recognised the NMP programme is not included within this data as it is a post-registration qualification.
 - The visitors were therefore satisfied with how the education provider was performing in this area.
- **Programme level data:**
 - The education provider reflected on the numbers of learners on the NMP programme. This totalled 75 across two cohorts. However, of this, 21 were HCPC registrants.
 - They also outlined how they had ensured an appropriate staff / student ration considering the requirement to fill roles during the period.
 - The visitors were therefore satisfied with how the education provider had performed in this area.

Risks identified which may impact on performance: None.

Outstanding issues for follow up: None.

Section 5: Issues identified for further review

This section summarises any areas which require further follow-up through a separate quality assurance process (the approval or focused review process).

There were no outstanding issues to be referred to another process

Section 6: Decision on performance review outcomes

Assessment panel recommendation

Based on the findings detailed in section 4, the visitors recommend to the Education and Training Committee that:

- The education provider is not required to engage with any further performance reviews.

Reason for next engagement recommendation

The initial portfolio was submitted in March 2023. During the review of this portfolio, the visitors identified a small number of areas for clarification. These are outlined in the Findings section. In response to these queries, the education provider confirmed they had taken the decision to discontinue the approved NMP programme. The last intake date is September 2023, and as it is a post registration programme consisting of one module, the last graduation date is expected to be in less than two years. We are currently in the process of confirming this.

As this means the number of learners on the programme will gradually be decreasing within the next two years, and as it is the only programme approved by HCPC at the education provider, there is no risk to how the standards will be met.

In addition, the approved programme has recently gone through the GPhC reaccreditation process to determine it meets the revised standards and competency framework.

Education and Training Committee decision

Education and Training Committee considered the assessment panel's recommendations and the findings which support these. The education provider was also provided with the opportunity to submit any observation they had on the conclusions reached.

Based on all information presented to them, the Committee decided that:

- The education provider does not need to engage with future performance reviews.

Reason for this decision: The Panel agreed with the visitors' recommendation that no further reviews are required as the programme is closing.

Appendix 1 – list of open programmes at this institution

Name	Mode of study	Profession	Modality	Annotation	First intake date	Last intake date
Postgraduate Certificate in Non-Medical Prescribing	DL (Distance learning)			Supplementary prescribing; Independent prescribing	01/02/2019	Sept 2023